arXiv:1703.05387v1 [math.AP] 15 Mar 2017

Positive solutions of indefinite semipositone problems via sub-super solutions *†

U. Kaufmann‡, H. Ramos Quoirin§

March 17, 2017

Abstract

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, be a smooth bounded domain, and let $m : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a possibly sign-changing function. We investigate the existence of positive solutions for the semipositone problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda m(x)(f(u) - k) & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda, k > 0$ and f is either sublinear at infinity with $f(0) = 0$, or f has a singularity at 0. We prove the existence of a positive solution for certain ranges of λ provided that the negative part of m is suitably small. Our main tool is the sub-supersolutions method, combined with some rescaling properties.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded and smooth domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 1$. We are concerned with the problem

$$(P_\lambda) \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda m(x)(f(u) - k) & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda, k > 0$ and $m : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ may change sign. Here either f is nonnegative and continuous on $[0, \infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ or f is positive and continuous in $(0, \infty)$ and singular at 0. Our main purpose is to establish existence results for *strictly* positive solutions of (P_λ).

In the first case, we assume that f is sublinear at infinity. More precisely, we suppose that f satisfies one of the following conditions:

*2010 *Mathematics Subject Clasification.* 35J25, 35J60, 35B09.

†*Key words and phrases.* Semipositone problems, indefinite nonlinearities, positive solutions, sub-supersolutions

‡FaMAF, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, (5000) Córdoba, Argentina. *E-mail address:* kaufmann@mate.uncor.edu

§Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Casilla 307, Correo 2, Santiago, Chile. *E-mail address:* humberto.ramos@usach.cl (Corresponding Author)

$(F1)$ For some $0 < p < 1$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{f(s)}{s^p} = 1. \tag{1.1}$$

$(F2)$ It holds that

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} f(s) := c < \infty. \tag{1.2}$$

Note that (P_λ) belongs in this case to the class of *semipositone* problems (for applications and further references on semipositone problems we refer the reader to [5, 7] and the nice survey papers [3, 13] and references therein). We observe that proving the existence of a positive solution of (P_λ) is not straightforward, since the strong maximum principle does not apply. In fact, even the existence of nonnegative solutions via standard variational methods is not clear for (P_λ) (even if $m \geq 0$).

In [2], the problem (P_λ) was investigated when $m \equiv 1$ and $\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{f(s)}{s} = 0$. Using the sub-supersolutions method, the existence of a nonnegative solution for λ sufficiently large was proved. Still in the case $m \equiv 1$, the authors of [5] followed a non-standard variational approach and proved non-existence, existence, and multiplicity results for nonnegative solutions in both the sublinear and superlinear cases. In addition, in the sublinear case they proved the existence of a positive solution when Ω is a ball.

On the other hand, in [1] the authors employed bifurcation and degree theory arguments to obtain a positive solution of (P_λ) for λ sufficiently large. However, their result holds when $m > 0$ in Ω. More concretely, they considered the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f(x,u) & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

and proved the following:

Theorem 1.1. *[1] Let $f : \overline{\Omega} \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that:*

1. *$f(x,0) < 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$.*
2. *There exists a continuous function $b : \overline{\Omega} \to (0,\infty)$ such that*

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \frac{f(x,s)}{s^q} = b(x) \quad \text{uniformly in } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \text{ with } 0 \leq q < 1.$$

Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (1.3) has a positive solution for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. More precisely, there exists a connected set of positive solutions of (1.3) bifurcating from infinity at $\lambda_\infty = \infty$.

Let us mention that they also dealt with the superlinear case, obtaining now a positive solution for all $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small. Still with f superlinear, but now with m allowed to change sign, one may combine rescaling and continuity arguments to show that (P_λ) has a positive solution for λ sufficiently small, see [4]. These arguments rely on the fact that the strong maximum principle applies to the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = m(x)u^p & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with $p > 1$. However, when $0 < p < 1$ and m changes sign in Ω, this is no longer true. We shall then follow a different approach, based on the sub-supersolutions method.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{P}^\circ$ the interior of the positive cone in $\mathcal{C}_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}^\circ := \{u \in \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega}) : u > 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \text{ and } \partial u/\partial\nu < 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\},$$

where ν is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. We also write as usual $m = m^+ - m^-$ with $m^+ := \max(m, 0)$ and $m^- := \max(-m, 0)$.

We next state our first main result:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $m \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be a continuous function with $f(0) = 0$. Assume one of the following conditions:*

1. *f satisfies $(F1)$.*
2. *f satisfies $(F2)$ with $c > k$.*

If $\|m^-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ is sufficiently small, then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (P_λ) has a solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Moreover, $u_\lambda(x) \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$ for every $x \in \Omega$.

To be more specific, the smallness condition on m^- in Theorem 1.2 should hold with respect to m^+. In case (1), it must be such that, for some $\delta > 0$, the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = (1-\delta)\, m^+(x)\, w^p - m^-(x)\, w^p & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

has a solution $w \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, see Corollary 2.3 below. Some examples of such condition on m can be found in [9, Theorems 2.1 (ii), 3.1 and 3.3] when $N = 1$ or when Ω is a ball and m is radial, and more generally for any smooth bounded domain in [10, Theorem 3.1]. We note that the solution found in the above theorem in fact lies in $W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ for some $q > N$, and thus also in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\theta}(\overline{\Omega})$ with $0 < \theta < 1$.

In case (2), we require m^- to be sufficiently small so that the unique solution u of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = m(x) & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{P}^\circ$ (regarding this issue, see Remark 2.5 below). Let us point out that the above condition was used in [6] in order tu study existence of positive solutions to some superlinear elliptic problems, and also [12] for getting positive solutions for some indefinite singular sublinear problems.

Let us also remark that the main difficulty in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is to provide a positive subsolution of (P_λ). Even though Theorem 1.2 is already known in the case $m > 0$, to the best of our knowledge, our way of getting a positive subsolution is new even in this case, and extends naturally to the case where m changes sign.

Next, we deal with (P_λ) in the singular case, namely, when $f : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is continuous and satisfies:

$(F3)$ For some $p > 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to 0^+} f(s)s^p = 1. \tag{1.6}$$

In this case we have:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $m \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be a continuous function satisfying $(F3)$. If $\|m^-\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ is sufficiently small, then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (P_λ) has a positive solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$. Moreover,*

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} \|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 0.$$

The smallness condition on m^- in Theorem 1.3 must be such that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = (m(x) - \delta)\, w^{-p} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admits a positive solution for some $\delta > 0$. Such conditions can be found in [11, Corollaries 3.7 and 4.6]. Let us mention that singular problems similar to (P_λ), with a nonnegative weight m, have been widely studied in the literature (see e.g. [13, 15, 16, 17] and references therein), while recently the case $k = 0$ and m sign-changing was considered in [11].

2 Proof of the main results

Given $m \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > N$, let $u \in W^{2,q}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ be the unique solution of (1.5) and let $\mathcal{S} : L^q(\Omega) \to W^{2,q}(\Omega)$ be the corresponding solution operator, i.e., $\mathcal{S}(m) := u$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $m, h \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > N$, with $0 \not\equiv h \geq 0$ in Ω. Suppose that for some $\delta > 0$ the problem (1.4) has a solution $w \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. Then there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$ there exists $u_\beta \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = m(x)\, u^p - \beta h(x) & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. First we observe that if $\varphi := \mathcal{S}(m^+) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ and $t \geq \|\varphi\|_\infty^{\frac{p}{1-p}}$, then $t\varphi$ is a supersolution of (2.1). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(t\varphi) &\geq (t\|\varphi\|_\infty)^p m^+(x) \\ &\geq m(x)(t\varphi)^p \geq m(x)(t\varphi)^p - \beta h(x) \qquad \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let $v := \mathcal{S}(h)$ and fix $\delta > 0$ and $w \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ a solution of (1.4). Then there exists $\beta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$ we have that $\beta v \leq \delta w$ in Ω, and consequently

$$(1-\delta)w \leq w - \beta v \qquad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{2.2}$$

Now, for such β, employing (2.2) we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(w-\beta v) &= (1-\delta)m^+(x)w^p - m^-(x)w^p - \beta h(x) \\ &\leq (1-\delta)^p m^+(x)w^p - m^-(x)(w-\beta v)^p - \beta h(x) \\ &\leq m^+(x)(w-\beta v)^p - m^-(x)(w-\beta v)^p - \beta h(x) \qquad \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $w - \beta v$ is a subsolution of (2.1). Thus, applying the well-known sub-supersolutions method in the presence of well-ordered weak sub and supersolutions (see e.g. [8, Theorem 4.9]) we obtain a solution $u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Moreover, by standard regularity arguments we deduce that $u \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$, $q > N$, and so, since $w - \beta v \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, we may conclude also that $u \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. ■

Theorem 2.2. *Let $m \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a continuous function satisfying $(F1)$ and $f(0) = 0$. Assume in addition that for some $\beta > 0$ the problem*

$$(P_{m,\beta}) \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta w = m(x)w^p - \beta & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a positive solution $w \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (P_λ) has a positive solution $u_\lambda \in W^{2,q}(\Omega)$, $q > N$, for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Moreover, $u_\lambda(x) \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$ for every $x \in \Omega$.

Proof. We set $\underline{u}_\lambda := \lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w$, so that

$$-\Delta \underline{u}_\lambda = \lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} (m(x)w^p - \beta).$$

Thus $\underline{u}_\lambda$ is a subsolution of (P_λ) if and only if

$$\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} (m(x)w^p - \beta) \leq \lambda m(x) \left(f(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w) - k \right). \tag{2.3}$$

This inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{\beta}{w^p} \geq m(x) \left(1 - \frac{f(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w)}{\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w\right)^p} \right) + \frac{km(x)}{\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w\right)^p}. \tag{2.4}$$

Let us set $\varepsilon := \inf_{x\in\Omega} \dfrac{\beta}{w(x)^p}$. Since $\lim_{s\to\infty} \dfrac{f(s)}{s^p} = 1$, there exists $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$\left|1 - \frac{f(s)}{s^p}\right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|m\|_\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{k}{s^p} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2\|m\|_\infty} \quad \text{for } s > s_0.$$

Hence, for $x \in \Omega$ such that $\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x) > s_0$ we have

$$m(x)\left(1 - \frac{f(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x))}{\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x)\right)^p}\right) + \frac{km(x)}{\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x)\right)^p} < \varepsilon \le \frac{\beta}{w(x)^p},$$

so that (2.3) holds for such x.

Now we set $S := \sup_{0\le s\le s_0} |s^p - f(s)|$ and fix $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lambda^{\frac{p}{1-p}}\beta - km(x) > S\|m\|_\infty$$

for every $x \in \Omega$ if $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$. Consequently, if $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$ and $x \in \Omega$ is such that $\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x) \le s_0$, then

$$\left|m(x)\left(\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x)\right)^p - f(\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x))\right)\right| \le S\|m\|_\infty < \lambda^{\frac{p}{1-p}}\beta - km(x),$$

which yields (2.3). Therefore, $\underline{u}_\lambda$ is a subsolution of (P_λ) for $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$.

On the other hand, let $e := \mathcal{S}(1)$. We define $\overline{u}_\lambda := t(e+1)$ with $t > 0$. Then $\overline{u}_\lambda$ is a supersolution of (P_λ) if and only if

$$t \ge \lambda m(x)\left(f(t(e+1)) - k\right) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

i.e.

$$1 \ge \lambda m(x)\frac{f(t(e+1)) - k}{t(e+1)}(e+1) \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{2.5}$$

Since $\lim_{s\to\infty} \dfrac{f(s)}{s} = 0$, it follows that given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $s_1 > 0$ such that $\left|\frac{f(s)-k}{s}\right| < \varepsilon$ for every $s > s_1$. In particular, if $t > s_1$ then $t(e(x)+1) > t > s_1$, so that

$$\left|\frac{f(t(e+1)) - k}{t(e+1)}\right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Thus we see that (2.5) holds for all t sufficiently large. Taking t larger if necessary, we have $\lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w \le t(e+1)$ in Ω, i.e. $\underline{u}_\lambda \le \overline{u}_\lambda$ in Ω. We obtain then, for $\lambda \ge \lambda_0$, a solution u_λ of (P_λ) satisfying $\underline{u}_\lambda \le u_\lambda \le \overline{u}_\lambda$. In particular, for every $x \in \Omega$ we have $u_\lambda(x) \ge \lambda^{\frac{1}{1-p}} w(x) \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$.

The proof is now complete. ■

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.1 we have the following:

Corollary 2.3. *Let $m \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ and $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a continuous function satisfying $(F1)$ and $f(0) = 0$. Assume in addition that for some $\delta > 0$ the problem (1.4) has a solution $w \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (P_λ) has a solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Moreover, $u_\lambda(x) \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$ for every $x \in \Omega$.*

We now consider the case where f is bounded:

Theorem 2.4. *Let $m \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > N$, and $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ be a continuous function satisfying $(F2)$ with $c > k$ and $f(0) = 0$. Assume in addition that $\mathcal{S}(m) \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (P_λ) has a solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. Moreover, $u_\lambda(x) \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$ for every $x \in \Omega$.*

Proof. Let c be given by $(F2)$ and define $C := \sup_{s>0} f(s)$. Observe that $C \in [c,\infty)$. We also set, for $\delta > 0$,

$$\Omega_\delta := \{x \in \Omega : dist(x, \partial\Omega) \geq \delta\}$$

and

$$M_\delta(x) := (c-k)\, m(x) - \delta\, |m(x)|\, \chi_{\Omega_\delta} - \left(cm(x) + Cm^-(x)\right) \chi_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta},$$

where χ_A denotes the characteristic function of A.

Since $c > k$, $\mathcal{S}(m) \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$ and the solution operator $\mathcal{S} : L^q(\Omega) \to \mathcal{C}^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is continuous, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = M_\delta(x) & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admits a solution $w \in \mathcal{P}^{\circ}$. Now, $w(x) \geq \eta > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega_\delta$ and some $\eta > 0$, and hence taking into account (1.2) we see that there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda m(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k) &= \lambda m^+(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k) - \lambda m^-(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k) \\ &\geq \lambda m^+(x)\,(c - k - \delta) - \lambda m^-(x)\,(c - k + \delta) \\ &= \lambda M_\delta(x) \qquad \text{in } \Omega_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

On the other side, for all $\lambda > 0$, we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda m(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k) &= \lambda m^+(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k) - \lambda m^-(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k) \\ &\geq -\lambda m^+(x)\, k - \lambda m^-(x)\,(C - k) \\ &= \lambda M_\delta(x) \qquad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

So, $-\Delta(\lambda w) \leq \lambda m(x)\,(f(\lambda w) - k)$ in Ω and therefore λw is a subsolution of (P_λ).

Let now $\varphi := \mathcal{S}(|m|) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$ and C be as above. Given $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, we choose $t_0 \geq \lambda C$. Since $C > k$, we get, for every $t \geq t_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(t\varphi) &\geq \lambda m^+(x) C + \lambda m^-(x) k \\ &\geq \lambda m^+(x) f(t\varphi) + \lambda m^-(x) k \\ &\geq \lambda m(x) (f(t\varphi) - k) \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $t\varphi$ is a supersolution of (P_λ). Enlarging t if necessary, so that $t\varphi \geq \lambda w$ in Ω, we obtain then, for $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, a solution u_λ of (P_λ) satisfying that $\lambda w \leq u_\lambda \leq t\varphi$ in Ω. In particular, $u_\lambda(x) \to \infty$ as $\lambda \to \infty$ for every $x \in \Omega$, and this ends the proof of the theorem. ■

Remark 2.5. Let $\delta_\Omega(x) := dist(x, \partial\Omega)$. If $\Omega := (a,b) \subset \mathbb{R}$, it follows directly from Lemma 2.1 in [11] that if

$$\max\left\{\int_a^b (t-a) m^-(t)\, dt, \int_a^b (b-t) m^-(t)\, dt\right\} < \int_a^b \delta_\Omega(t) m^+(t)\, dt,$$

then $\mathcal{S}(m) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. For a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, Lemma 2.2 in [11] allows us to reach the same conclusion provided that

$$c_\Omega \left\|m^-\right\|_{L^q(\Omega)} < \int_\Omega \delta_\Omega(x) m^+(x)\, dx,$$

where $c_\Omega > 0$ is some constant depending only on Ω. ■

Remark 2.6. Let f be merely bounded, define $l_0 := \underline{\lim}_{s\to\infty} f(s)$ and $l_1 := \overline{\lim}_{s\to\infty} f(s)$, and suppose that $l_0 > k$. Then, reasoning as in Theorem 2.4 one can show the existence of positive solutions of (P_λ) for λ large enough provided that $\mathcal{S}(l_0 m^+ - l_1 m^-) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. It is an interesting open question to see if this remains true just under the hypothesis of Theorem 2.4, namely, $\mathcal{S}(m) \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$. ■

We finally study the case of a singular nonlinearity. For the precise definition of sub and supersolutions in this case we refer to [14, Section 4].

Theorem 2.7. *Let $m \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $f : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ be a continuous function satisfying $(F3)$. Assume that for some $\delta > 0$ the problem*

$$(P_{m,\delta}) \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta w = (m(x) - \delta) w^{-p} & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ w = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a positive solution $w \in \mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$. Then there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that (P_λ) has a positive solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$ for every $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0^+} \|u_\lambda\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$ and w be as in the statement of the theorem. Define

$$\sigma := \frac{1}{1+p} \in (0,1)\,.$$

Note that $1 - \sigma p = \sigma$. Let $v := \lambda^\sigma w$. So v is a subsolution of (P_λ) if and only if

$$-\Delta v = \lambda^\sigma (m(x) - \delta) w^{-p} \leq \lambda m(x) \left(f(\lambda^\sigma w) - k\right),$$

i.e.

$$(m(x) - \delta) w^{-p} \leq \lambda^{1-\sigma} m(x) \left(f(\lambda^\sigma w) - k\right).$$

Multiplying by w^p and using that $1-\sigma = \sigma p$, we get the equivalent condition

$$\delta \geq m(x) \left(1 - f(\lambda^\sigma w)\, (\lambda^\sigma w)^p\right) + k m(x)\, (\lambda^\sigma w)^p\,.$$

Now, since m and w are bounded and $\lim\limits_{s\to 0^+} f(s)s^p = 1$, we see that for λ sufficiently small the inequality above holds, and thus v is a subsolution of (P_λ).

On the other hand, let $\varphi := \mathcal{S}(|m|)$ and $t > 0$. Then,

$$-\Delta\left(t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma\right) = t\lambda^\sigma \left(-\sigma\varphi^{\sigma-1}\Delta\varphi - \sigma(\sigma-1)\varphi^{\sigma-2}|\nabla\varphi|^2\right) \geq t\sigma\lambda^\sigma\varphi^{\sigma-1}|m(x)|,$$

so that $t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma$ is a supersolution of (P_λ) whenever

$$t\sigma(\lambda\varphi)^{\sigma-1} \geq f(t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad t\sigma(\lambda\varphi)^{\sigma-1} \geq k. \tag{2.6}$$

The first inequality in (2.6) holds if

$$t^{p+1}\sigma = t^{p+1}\sigma(\lambda\varphi)^{\sigma(p+1)-1} \geq f(t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma)\,(t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma)^p \qquad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Recalling that $\lim_{s\to 0^+} f(s)s^p = 1$, we obtain some $s_1 > 0$ such that

$$f(s)s^p < 2 \quad \text{for } 0 < s \leq s_1.$$

Consequently, if $t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma \leq s_1$ and $t^{p+1}\sigma > 2$ then

$$f(t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma)\,(t(\lambda\varphi)^\sigma)^p < t^{p+1}\sigma.$$

In other words, if we choose $t > 0$ such that $t^{p+1}\sigma > 2$ and

$$\lambda_0 \leq \left(\frac{s_1}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \|\varphi\|_\infty^{-1},$$

then the first inequality in (2.6) holds for $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$. Moreover, if in addition

$$\lambda_0 \leq \left(\frac{t\sigma}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} \|\varphi\|_\infty^{-1},$$

then the second inequality in (2.6) also is true for $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$.

Finally, since $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}^\circ$, we may take t in such a way that $w \leq t\varphi^\sigma$. Therefore, [14, Theorem 4.1] provides us a solution $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^1(\Omega) \cap \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$ of (P_λ) such that $\lambda^\sigma w \leq u_\lambda \leq t\lambda^\sigma\varphi^\sigma$ for $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$. In particular, we have that $\|u_\lambda\|_\infty \to 0$ as $\lambda \to 0^+$. The proof is now complete. ■

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, D. Arcoya, B. Buffoni, *Positive solutions for some semipositone problems via bifurcation theory*, Differential Integral Equations **7** (1994), 655-663.

[2] A. Castro, J. B. Garner, R. Shivaji, *Existence results for classes of sublinear semipositone problems*, Results Math. **23** (1993), 214-220.

[3] A. Castro, C. Maya, R. Shivaji, *Nonlinear eigenvalue problems with semipositone structure*, Electron. J. Differ. Equ. Conf. **5** (2000), 33-49.

[4] D. Costa, H. Ramos Quoirin, H. Tehrani, *A variational approach to superlinear semipositone elliptic problems*, preprint.

[5] D. Costa, H. Tehrani, J. Yang, *On a variational approach to existence and multiplicity results for semipositone problems*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2006**, No. 11, 10 p.

[6] Q. Dai, Y. Gu, *Positive solutions for non-homogeneous semilinear elliptic equations with data that changes sign*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **133** (2003), 297–306.

[7] E. N. Dancer, J. Shi, *Uniqueness and nonexistence of positive solutions to semipositone problems*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **38** (2006), 1033-1044.

[8] Y. Du, *Order structure and topological methods in nonlinear partial differential equations. Vol. 1. Maximum principles and applications*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2006.

[9] T. Godoy, U. Kaufmann, *On strictly positive solutions for some semilinear elliptic problems*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. **20** (2013), 779-795.

[10] T. Godoy, U. Kaufmann, *Existence of strictly positive solutions for sublinear elliptic problems in bounded domains*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **14** (2014), 353-359.

[11] T. Godoy, U. Kaufmann, *On Dirichlet problems with singular nonlinearity of indefinite sign*, J. Math Anal. Appl. **428** (2015), 1239-1251.

[12] J. Hernández, F. Mancebo, J. Vega, *On the linearization of some singular, nonlinear elliptic problems and applications*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **19** (2002), 777–813.

[13] E. Lee, R. Shivaji, J. Ye, *Subsolutions: a journey from positone to infinite semipositone problems*, Electron. J. Differ. Equ. Conf. **17** (2009), 123–131.

[14] N. H. Loc, K. Schmitt, *Applications of sub-supersolution theorems to singular nonlinear elliptic problems*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **11** (2011), 493-524.

[15] K. Perera, E. Silva, *Existence and multiplicity of positive solutions for singular quasilinear problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **323** (2006), 1238-1252.

[16] K. Perera, Z. Zhang, *Multiple positive solutions of singular p-Laplacian problems by variational methods*, Bound. Value Probl. **2005**, no. 3, 377-82.

[17] L. Zhao, Y. He, P. Zhao, *The existence of three positive solutions of a singular p-Laplacian problem*, Nonlinear Anal. **74** (2011), 5745–5753.